

unauthorized practice of law. Thus, Plaintiffs claim that Moss Codilis had no right to collect fees from TMS for Moss Codilis' work on the Breach Letter Program, and that those fees must be returned to the Plaintiffs who reimbursed TMS for these fees.

2. The undisputed facts, however, show that there was no such unauthorized practice. Ms. Nash's supervisor, a partner and duly-licensed attorney at Moss Codilis, performed the legal work involved in creating the template letters for the Breach Letter Program to make sure they conformed with applicable state and federal law. The remainder of the work was an exercise in mass production overseen by Ms. Nash. Her function was administrative, and she did not engage in the practice of law at all.

3. Furthermore, Ms. Nash's responsibility with the Breach Letter Program all but ended in late 1999, when Moss Codilis hired Valerie Bromley to replace Ms. Nash in that role. Ms. Bromley became a duly licensed attorney in October 1999. Plaintiff Vincent's Breach Letter was sent on or about March 22, 2000, during the time when Ms. Nash had only limited responsibility over the Breach Letter Program and a Colorado-licensed attorney had replaced her. Thus, Plaintiff Vincent's claim fails.

4. Finally, Plaintiff Gutierrez's claim fails because she was never charged for fees associated with the Breach Letters and therefore, she have no standing to challenge the fees Moss Codilis charged to TMS under any theory articulated by Plaintiffs. Gutierrez's claim is further barred by the doctrine of judicial estoppel because she failed to disclose her claim in this case during her 2004 bankruptcy. Gutierrez's claim also fails for the same reason as Vincent's claim – she received her Breach Letters in September and October of 2000, during the time when a Colorado-licensed attorney had replaced Ms. Nash.

For these reasons which are explained in detail in Moss Codilis' accompanying Memorandum in Support, Moss Codilis respectfully requests that this Court grant its Motion for Summary Judgment, and enter judgment in its favor and against Plaintiffs.

Dated: November 12, 2010

MOSS, CODILIS, STAWIARSKI, MORRIS,
SCHNEIDER & PRIOR, LLP

By: /s/ David J. Chizewer

David J. Chizewer (ARDC 06206747)

Jon E. Klinghoffer (ARDC 06270082)

GOLDBERG KOHN LTD.

55 East Monroe Street

Suite 3300

Chicago, Illinois 60603

(312) 201-4000

Thomas P. Battistoni (TPB 8012)

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP

900 Third Avenue

23rd Floor

New York, New York 10022

(212) 753-5000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned, an attorney, certifies that he caused a copy of **MOSS CODILIS'**
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT to be served via on November 12, 2010 upon the
following:

Paul S. Grobman
Law Offices of Paul S. Grobman
555 – Fifth Avenue
17th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Via the Court's ECF/electronic mailing system

Himanshu R. Sharma
Suite 2002
286 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10017
Via Federal Express

Kenneth F. McCallion
McCallion & Associates LLP
24 West 40th Street
New York, New York 10018
Via the Court's ECF/electronic mailing system

W. Hans Kobelt
Daniel A. Pollack
McCarter & English, LLP
27th Floor
245 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10167
Via the Court's ECF/electronic mailing system

/s/ David J. Chizewer

David J. Chizewer